

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Ki-Hyun KIM et al.

Application No. 10/580,935

Group Art Unit: 2112

Confirmation No. 6786

Filed: May 30, 2006

Examiner: Esaw T. Abraham

For: INTERLEAVING METHOD FOR LOW DENSITY PARITY CHECK ENCODING

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 30, 2008, having a shortened period for response set to expire on October 30, 2008, the following remarks are provided.

I. Provisional Election of Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.142

Applicants provisionally elect Group 1 (claims 1-7, 13, and 14) in response to the preliminary restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action.

II. Applicants Traverse the Requirement

Insofar as Group II is concerned, it is believed that claims 8-12, 15, and 16 are so closely related to elected claims 1-7, 13, and 14 that they should remain in the same application. The elected claims 1-7, 13, and 14 are directed to an interleaving method that divides a generated code word vector into interleaving units having a size that is based on bit lengths, and claims 8-12, 15, and 16 are drawn to a method of determining the size of the interleaving unit based on bit lengths. There have been no references cited to show any necessity for requiring restriction and, in fact, it is believed that the Examiner would find references containing both method claims in the same field of technology. While it is noted that the Examiner has identified different classifications for the method claims, it is believed that classification is not conclusive on the question of restriction. It is believed, moreover, that evaluation of both sets of claims would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time in comparison with the additional

expense and delay to Applicants in having to protect the additional subject matter recited by the Group II claims by filing a divisional application.

MPEP §803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. (A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the method recited by the Group II claims are directed to a method of determining the size of the interleaving unit based on bit lengths, and elected claims 1-7, 13, and 14 are directed to an interleaving method that divides a generated code word vector into interleaving units having a size that is based on bit lengths, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.


If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 503333.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/17/08

By: 
Fadi N. Kiblawi
Registration No. 61,973

1400 Eye St., NW., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510